4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

brilliance." The Slavic sun god was also known as Dazhbog, the god which gives life and fertility, but neither appellation, curiously enough, appears among the Southern Slavs. Dazhbog is occasionally called the son of Svarog, the god of fire.

A more general Slavic deity was Veles or Volos. In the Russian *Primary Chronicle* he is characterized as "the god of cattle," but this qualification has no relation to the original attributes of Veles. It results rather from the monkish chronicler's identification of the specifically Russian form of his name (Volos) with that of Saint Blasius, a Cappadocian bishop who died a martyr's death about 315 A.D., and was extensively revered thereafter as a patron of flocks and herds. In the *Primary Chronicle,* where Perun and Veles are mentioned together as gods by whom the Scandinavian Varangians and the Slavs of Kiev swore, the implication is that the Varangians swore by Perun (here the equivalent of Thor) and the Slavs by Veles, who thus may be viewed as the guardian of oaths, a sort of *Zeus epiorkios.* The name Veles itself is cognate with various Lithuanian words meaning "corpse," "ghost," and "devil," so that Veles is rather to be considered as a god of the dead, a conclusion justified by his frequent invocation in various late Bohemian curses.

Idols were used by the Eastern Slavs, and the medieval German chroniclers describe sanctuaries which the Baltic Slavs erected to their gods. Of these the most celebrated was that at Arkona, on the island of Rugen, dedicated to the god Svantovit, whose statue adorned it. Svantovit seems merely a local variant of Svarog, the sun god, and various other local deities of the same type are mentioned in medieval non-Slavic sources. If the Slavs did honor a supreme deity, it is reasonably clear that he was a thunder or a sun god like Perun or Svarog, who would thus reflect the more or less general Indo-European belief in such a deity who appears as Zeus, Jupiter, or the old Germanic Tiuz. Only among the Baltic Slavs is the existence of a special caste of priests attested.

A final and equally interesting problem connected with the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

though the local clergy from Passau and Regensburg viewed them as dangerous rivals, for these Greeks were scholars and men of action who had the advantage of speaking the local language. At first they celebrated Mass in Greek, which was as incomprehensible to the masses as the Latin of the Frankish clergy. Constantine then hastened to translate the whole service, which only added to the resentment of their competitors, despite the fact that he actually translated not the Byzantine ritual but the Latin missal. In Western eyes this was a drastic and unparalleled innovation. Whatever Rostislav's good intentions were, he was not for long in a position to support the Greeks wholeheartedly, for in the autumn of 864 he had been attacked and once more reduced to vassalage by Louis the German. Yet the mission prospered to the point where the problem of ordaining new priests presented itself. Constantine even made a visit to the son of Pribina, Prince Kotzel, on Lake Balaton, who became an enthusiastic admirer of the brothers' work and confided fifty young men to him for training.

Since it was obviously undesirable, if not impossible, for Constantine and Methodius to have their disciples ordained by the bishops of Passau or Salzburg, they decided, after three years of missionary activity, to journey to Rome, where they could obtain the endorsement of Pope Nicholas I. The brothers were by no means hostile to the Pope; on the contrary, in common with numerous other Byzantine ecclesiastics of their day, they regarded the Bishop of Rome not only as the patriarch of the West but also as the supreme head of the Church. News of their arrival in Venice inspired a special invitation from Pope Nicholas to wait upon him, but before they left Venice he died in November 867 and was succeeded a month later by Adrian II. Though the Frankish opposition to the Slavic liturgy had been transmitted to the Roman clergy, Adrian ordered the ordination of the candidates whom Constantine and Methodius presented, and authorized the use of the Slavic liturgy. Constantine survived his triumph but a few

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

months. Broken in health, he retired to an Italian monastery where he assumed the name of Cyril and died on February 4, 869.

Meanwhile, in Pannonia, Prince Kotzel became worried over the long absence of the young priests he had detailed for ordination. When he sent a special mission to inquire about them, the Pope dismissed Methodius and his followers with a letter addressed jointly to Rostislav, to the latter's nephew Svatopluk, and to Kotzel, stating that he was designating Methodius as an emissary not merely to Pannonia, but to Moravia as well, but, fearful of irritating the Frankish clergy, he momentarily abstained from naming Methodius Bishop of Pannonia, as Kotzel preferred, since this action would have detached Pannonia from the diocese of Salzburg. His hesitation was banished, however, by Rostislav's military successes against Louis the German in 869, which diminished the authority of the Frankish clergy, and also by the news that Boris of Bulgaria was turning from Rome to Byzantium. In order to block any further expansion of Byzantine influence and to tie the Danubian Slavs more closely to Rome, he thus consecrated Methodius as Archbishop of Pannonia and named him papal legate to all the Slavs.

The success of this design was almost immediately compromised by unforeseen political developments. In 870, Rostislav was deposed by his nephew Svatopluk, who became a Frankish vassal. On his arrival in Moravia, Methodius was arrested and brought before a court comprising the bishops of Passau, Salzburg, and Freising, who professed total ignorance of his new episcopal status. Far from doing anything to protect Methodius, Svatopluk was actually present when Hermanarich, Bishop of Passau, struck the Greek bishop with his whip. Discovering, however, that he was merely the catspaw of the Franks, Svatopluk soon reversed his field and by 874 was independent. The curia meanwhile endeavored to ascertain what had happened to Methodius. The Bishop of Freising denied to

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

attained by every individual, nevertheless produced some admirable characters among early medieval churchmen and laymen.

The sources from which Vladimir drew his clergy present a problem of some importance and complexity. Adequate evidence exists that Greek priests were sent to Russia both in the suite of the Princess Anna and after her marriage to Vladimir. Since there were isolated Christians and at least one church at Kiev prior to Vladimir's conversion, there must have been a small nucleus of Russian-speaking clergy in the city itself before 989, though these clerics were probably of Greek nationality. Vladimir's well-attested activity in wholesale conversion even among the masses at widely separated points makes it likely, however, that some provision was made for evangelizing the people in a language comprehensible to them. Priests with the appropriate linguistic qualifications could be found at this period only among members of the Byzantine clergy who had been active in Bulgaria or among the Bulgarian clergy themselves, since the differentiation between the spoken languages of Bulgaria and south Russia in the late tenth century was so slight as to constitute no barrier to common understanding.

The tradition of vernacular religious culture under Greek intellectual auspices had been established in Bulgaria during the reigns of Boris (852-889) and Simeon (894-927). In the light of the eventual transmission to Kiev of a large body of ecclesiastical literature in Old Bulgarian translations, it is an accepted and doubtless correct convention of Russian literary history in the pre-Tartar period to assume that these works were first transmitted to Kievan Russia through the medium of Byzantium as priests were sent out into the Russian field. But, curiously enough, there are no historical data behind this respectable hypothesis, nor does any explicit evidence point to the slightest direct contact between the charges of Bulgaria and Russia during the principates of Vladimir and of his son through 1045.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

While some ingenious theories to the contrary have been expounded, the fact remains that Byzantine relations with Bulgaria were constantly hostile from Vladimir's conversion to his death in 1015. Basil II would thus hardly have attached to an enemy state the young church founded by his brother-in-law. There is therefore no motive for believing that the Russian church at its foundation was other than an eparchy of the Byzantine patriarchate, even if we admit the contention that there was no metropolitanate in Russia during Vladimir's lifetime. In the transmission of Slavic liturgical and theological texts at this period the mediation of Constantinople was inevitable, and the priests at Vladimir's disposal must have likewise been chiefly Greeks, some of whom possessed a smattering of Bulgarian from work in Bulgaria itself or, like the proto-apostles Constantine and Methodius, from their contacts in the northern and western marches of the Byzantine Empire.

That Vladimir assimilated certain intellectual interests along with the faith is indicated by his insistence upon some degree of education among the children of his followers. The *Primary Chronicle* reports:

> *He took the children of the best families and sent them for instruction in book learning. The mothers of these children wept bitterly over them, for they were not yet strong in faith, but mourned as for the dead.*

It is not clear whether Vladimir intended that these youths should be trained as priests or as civil servants, but from the facts that within the next fifty years educated Russian priests come to the fore and that extensive reference is made in the sources to the culture of Vladimir's son and successor Yaroslav the Wise, it is fair to suppose that Vladimir had his eye on both professions. In Constantinople at the close of the tenth century interest in higher education was restricted by the general attention to military problems and conquest, so that book learning was primarily a matter of personal and private

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Kiev in 1240. No remnant of it now survives except the ruins of its foundations.

In Vladimir's day the clergy rapidly assumed a place among the ruling class. Apart from introducing new notions of judicial procedure derived from the Greek *Nomokanon*, the early clergy also undertook to advise Vladimir on affairs of state and local policy. In 992 the bishops advised the substitution of corporal punishment for fines in order to suppress brigandage and similarly suggested that the proceeds of fines in other cases should be spent on military equipment for defense against the menacing nomads. The ecclesiastical courts also assumed jurisdiction over numerous social problems and offenses which took new significance in the light of the Christian moral code: bigamy, divorce, heresy, sacrilege, witchcraft, and adultery. Vladimir thus tolerated the fusion of church and state on the basis of contemporary Byzantine usage.

By the process of conversion among the various Slavic groups, the bases of cultural and political differentiation were thus laid before the year 1000. Exposed to Christian influences since the seventh century, the Slovenes were converted by Bavarian clergy, and after their absorption into the Carolingian empire in 788, remained until the first World War in submission to one German state or another. The Croats, though in contact with the mission of Constantine and Methodius, reverted to Rome after the disciples of Methodius were expelled from Moravia, and have come down through the ages as Catholics, whatever their political allegiance. The Slavs along the Elbe and the Baltic were subjected to the most violent political and religious pressure from Saxon priests and nobles with the result that, despite heroic revolts, they were slowly pushed back toward the former Polish frontier. The Byzantine influence in Moravia lasted but a quarter of a century before the work of the proto-apostles, Constantine and Methodius collapsed, and the Moravians, like the Czechs, remained under the pastoral care of bishops of the Roman rite. Though the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

acterize them as well-read and good linguists for their day and time. But during the Tartar hegemony such items are totally lacking. Not only the princes but even the higher clergy were frequently illiterate. Dmitri Donskoi could hardly read, and Basil II, Ivan the Terrible's great-grandfather, could neither read nor write. At the Council of Florence in 1439, Pope Eugene IV was told that the contemporary Russian bishops had little learning, and a feeble light of culture was kept burning in the Russian Church of this period solely by the appointment of Greek metropolitan bishops in Moscow. Only at the end of the fifteenth century do we encounter new interest in the foundation of schools for training the clergy, and considerable pressure in this direction was exercised by the Greek and South Slavic scholars who emigrated to Russia to escape the yoke of the Turks.

The advancement of clerical scholarship during the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505) was accompanied by a characteristic effort to acquire foreign techniques. Here, of course, we have an early example of what was to repeat itself so often in later days whenever the advancement of Russia required new mechanical skills. Under Ivan III Italian specialists were particularly active. The Bolognese architect Rudolfo Fioravanti not only built the Cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin, but also cast cannon, while Alevisio Novi, of Milan, designed and built the adjacent Cathedral of Saint Michael, in which were buried all subsequent Muscovite tsars to the time of Peter the Great. Miners, silversmiths, masons, and even an organist were imported from Hungary. Ivan the Terrible settled on the outskirts of Moscow in the so-called German suburb all German metalworkers who had been captured in his Livonian wars, and in 1567 obtained from England a doctor, an apothecary, and various goldsmiths. The Tsar was interested not only in material progress but also in raising the intellectual level of priests and officials, for it had been noted in the Church Council of 1551 that the opportunities for education were as yet slight. Besides, as the principality of Moscow developed into a

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

national state and a world power, the need for trained personnel in the government services and in commerce became evident if only for practical considerations. Ivan the Terrible himself was comparatively well-educated, while Boris Godunov, his progressive but ill-fated minister and eventual successor, was obliged by the innate conservatism of the clergy to abandon a promising project for the establishment at Moscow of an academy with learned foreigners as teachers.

For, despite isolated outbreaks of rationalism which manifested themselves in heretical movements, the intellectual horizon of the Russian clergy was discouragingly narrow. After the Council of Florence, they considered themselves the sole repository of Orthodox rectitude and resented even competent criticism. That learned scholar from Mount Athos, Maxim Grek, who had studied in Italy and heard Savonarola preach, was accused of heresy and imprisoned when he ventured to suggest textual corrections of the accepted liturgy, and though he lived on into the reign of Ivan the Terrible, he was always regarded with suspicion and never allowed to return to his native country until his death in 1556.

Whatever material progress was registered under the Muscovite princes, the introduction of new intellectual concepts encountered serious barriers. From a social standpoint also the Muscovite regime was responsible for the establishment of one institution which cast its dark shadow over Russia far down into the nineteenth century. Though slavery was not unknown, universal agrarian serfdom does not date from the origins of Russia. On the contrary, its evolution was gradual. In the early Muscovite period there were two classes of peasants: first, those who had lived for some time on state, church, or private land and payed various fixed duties on the parcels they occupied; second, the so-called movable peasants who rented parcels on term contracts. As the princes assigned estates to deserving officials who did not belong to the old landed aristocracy, some competition developed among proprietors for peasants to till their lands, with the result that by the middle of the sixteenth

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

was dependent upon the archdiocese of Magdeburg. On Easter Day 973, Mieszko, together with his Czech brother-in-law, was present as a vassal at Otto I's court in Quedlinburg. In spite of varying fortunes, the Polish ruler subsequently remained a reasonably faithful feudatory of the Saxon emperors until his own death in the summer of 992. 175*

His son Boleslav the Brave at first pursued the same policy, aiding Otto III against the rebellious Elbian Slavs in 994-995. But he subsequently rewarded himself for this aid by stretching his own territory westward to the Bober, and was on sufficiently good terms with Otto to receive his visit to Gnesen in the year 1000 and to see his capital raised to an archbishopric. Then, after Otto's death in 1002, while internal difficulties occupied his successor, Boleslav calmly appropriated the whole march of Meissen east of the Elbe and even subjugated Moravia. For the next decade all efforts to pry Boleslav loose from his gains proved unavailing, and it was only in 1013 that he made peace with Henry II because he had ambitious plans connected with the succession of Vladimir I of Kiev, whose son Boleslav's daughter had married. Later, by the Peace of Bautzen, concluded in 1018, Boleslav guaranteed himself the possession of Lusatia, thus biting still deeper into the march of Thuringia, and it was only in 1031 that Conrad II managed to drive the Poles out of it and to restore Poland to a state of vassalage.

The next two hundred years were marked by a serious decline in the energy and authority of the Polish state, caused by the weakness of its princes and the long struggle for domination between the throne on one hand and the magnates and the clergy on the other. It should be noted that the early clerics in Poland were mainly foreigners of either German or Bohemian birth. They held their charges directly from the king or prince and represented a stage in the administrative hierarchy, making the church an official institution. The clergy in general was supported by a tithe from villages and counties. 175* 793

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

The monasteries were, on the whole, the only large private landowners, and supplied an example by their organization of large manors worked by half-free peasants.

With the throne weakened by the pretensions of the Polish nobility, an aggressive foreign policy was unthinkable. After Vladislav Hermann accepted the status of a German vassal in 1080, no Polish prince dared assume the title of king for two centuries. The Elbe valley and Silesia were definitely lost, together with the Pomeranian seaboard west of the Vistula. Then, early in the thirteenth century, when the still pagan Prussians menaced Duke Conrad of Mazovia (along the Vistula northwest of Warsaw) he turned for aid to the knights of the Teutonic Order, who entered Mazovia and occupied the districts ceded to them in 1229. They immediately founded strong points at Thorn, Kulm, Elbing and elsewhere, and by placing themselves under papal protection obviated any chance of Polish sovereignty. The next fifty years were occupied by the struggle of the Teutonic Order, supported by the margraves of Brandenburg and Meissen, against the Prussians. Königsberg was founded in 1255, when the Slavic Duke of Pomerelia, on the lower Vistula north of Thorn, became a vassal of the Margrave of Brandenburg, and Danzig fell into German hands for the first time. The Brandenburgers, however, were unable to hold it, and it was not until 1343 that Polish claims to the so-called Pomorze were given up.

Apart from domestic disorders, Poland was also shaken during this period by a disastrous invasion of the Tartars, who in 1241 burned Cracow, invaded Silesia, and sacked Breslau. The depopulation caused both by civil war and this invasion impoverished the Polish princes and induced them to encourage German immigration. The movement had started even before the onslaught of the Tartars, for German villages began to appear in Silesia as early as 1140. But after the Tartar incursion, German settlements spread to every part of Poland. The belt laid waste by the Tartars had been thickly settled since the principal commercial highways between the west and the

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 829 648 will be founded—because it is in the force of events, because the peoples long for it, because it is the best possible solution to the present difficulties, and because, if it were not founded, these countries would fall a sure prey to Russia; Panslavism would be established in their place'. These few sentences—prophetic ones, moreover—provide the clue to all Serbian diplomatic thought, whether declared or understood, up to the 1914 War. The majority of the statesmen in Belgrade were partisans of a Russophile policy, with the exception of the old-time Progressists, and even so, one of their leaders, Stefan Novakovich, kept his confidence in the Tsarist Government. But, with these men, a Russophile policy never meant a Russian policy. We shall have defined the historical 'Russophilia' of the Balkan States, if we say that it always postulated the greatness of Russia, and was bounded by the determination to eliminate that country from internal affairs of the Peninsula.

186* 829 795 Yugoslav Catholics were inclined to be prejudiced in favour of Russia; this was due, on the one hand, to their geographical situation, beyond the reach of Russian ambitions, and, on the other, to the fact that their Catholicism was much less exclusivist than that of Poland, for instance. No doubt this intellectual liberty must be attributed to an instinctive reaction against the policy of the Vatican, which was then axed on Austria-Hungary, *i.e.*, on the two countries whose yoke the Yugoslavs aspired to shake off. The majority of the Croat and Slovene thinkers and poets of the nineteenth century were inspired by Slav traditions; the Illyrian movement was, in their countries, the starting-point • [793] of the national Renaissance. But the role of the Catholic clergy in this renaissance, and its connections with Orthodox Russia, is certainly one of the most decisive manifestations of that 'Slavonic conscience' which the politicians of St. Petersburg believed to be the attribute of the Orthodox Slavs. In Slovenia the priest, Jean Krek, the instigator of the Co-operative movement, and later on, Abbé Anton Korochets; in Croatia Bishop Strossmayer and Canon Ratski, were not only apostles of Slav solidarity, they had frequent contacts with the Russians. Strossmayer, who was one of the contrivers of Yugoslav unity, had not only been one of the opponents of the Vatican Council; he protested vigorously against the Holy See's anti-Russian attitude at the time of the 1877 War.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

countries and bring peace and liberty to men'. In the following September the Slav delegates to the Washington Congress of anti-Fascist Students passed a resolution calling upon their Anglo-American comrades to bring pressure to bear on their Governments with a view to opening a second European Front. In April, 1943, the Central Committee of the Congress of Slavs in America, sitting at Chicago, declared that if efforts were not made to crush Germany quickly, 'there will be nothing left to liberate but cemeteries'. They organised a 'Panslav Day' for June 22, and demanded the re-establishment of free circulation for Slav newspapers in Brazil.

Needless to add, there were reactionary or dissident movements, and certain Slav groups maintained contacts with the pro-Axis Governments, or pursued an anti-Soviet policy.

Their case was raised at the Congress of Slavs in America, which was held in Pittsburg on January 24, 1944, and was attended by seventy-five delegates from New York, Buffalo, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Saint-Louis, and even from Canada. This Congress studied reports on the activities of a hundred local committees during the year 1943. The chief subject for discussion was the attitude of the Committee of Americans of Polish Origin, of which Colonel Matuszewsky was the head, and of their newspaper, *Nowy Swiat,* which was unanimously censured. Then the Congress applauded a resolution approving Roosevelt's war policy as well as the Teheran, Moscow, and Cairo agreements. A second meeting was held in Pittsburg on September 23 and 24. Like the previous one, its chief object was to create a 'Slavonic electoral front' in favour of Roosevelt's candidature, to speed up the American war effort,[8] and to combat the action of the Matuszewsky Committee, a Polish breach in Slav solidarity. (The Congress of Americans of Polish Origin held in Buffalo in the preceding month had included this action on its agenda.)

* * *

A few months earlier, the Poles in America had been deeply moved by a strange episode, the journey of Father Stanislas Orlemanski to Moscow. This unassuming priest, of Polish

[8] The sale of bonds for the Fourth American War Loan by the Slav Committee of New York served to build, among other things, a bomber, 'The New York Slav', and a chaser, 'Spirit of Stalingrad'.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

648 793 159

origin, was in charge of a little Massachusetts church, the Holy Rosary, in the diocese of Springfield. Was he first sounded, and then invited to Moscow, as he himself was to allege, or did he improvise a mission? The facility with which he moved about in Russia, at a time when travelling was subject to severe restrictions, argues in favour of the former hypothesis. He was absent from April 17 to May 11, 1944, the object of his journey being, according to him, 'to see what he could do for the Catholic Church in Poland, Ukraine, and White Russia'. On his return he declared that he had twice been received by Stalin, and had obtained from him assurances, both verbal and written, in favour of religious liberty on Soviet territory. 'Future events will prove', he said, 'that Marshal Stalin nourishes very friendly sentiments towards the Roman Catholic Church. He wants a really democratic, independent Poland, capable of defending herself against any fresh aggression. The religion of the Polish people will be that of our ancestors; he will not tolerate any change. All he asks in return is a Poland animated with fraternal feelings towards the U.S.S.R.'.

Four hours after Father Orlemanski's return home, his bishop imposed the penalties provided for cases of unauthorised absence; he was forbidden to say Mass. After an attempted protest to the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, he submitted and solemnly promised never again to meddle with matters outside his priestly functions, upon which the bishop raised the interdict pronounced against him.

648 793 159 208

But his journey nevertheless aroused tremendous interest. The Soviet Radio called it a 'great international event', and the press published Orlemanski's declarations in full. As there are very few Catholics in Russia proper, the assurances given by Stalin referred especially to the liberated territories of the Ukraine and of Eastern Poland. The Tass Agency, emphasising the reality of these assurances, accused (though in moderate terms) the Hierarchy of the United States of having, in this matter, adopted a not very favourable attitude towards the Soviets. Whilst the *Christian Science Monitor* expressed satisfaction at the Orlemanski mission, and did not doubt that the Vatican would take advantage of the conciliatory attitude of the Soviets, the *Chicago Sun* placed its trust in the Catholic clergy's common sense to reject 'the poisoned advice of the agitators',

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

seeking to encourage the Church in her traditional opposition to the Soviets. But the *Post Dispatch* regretted that the Kremlin should have chosen such an unimportant person as Orlemanski for such a demonstration. The *Louisville Courier* deplored the censure passed on this priest by his bishop; no doubt the latter tolerated disparagement of the Soviet Union, but not efforts to understand it.

The truth seems to be that Father Orlemanski's initiative, whether concerted with Moscow or not, aroused in Slavonic circles reactions calculated to handicap the Government and prejudice Roosevelt's electoral campaign. While the Slavonic Committee of America approved this initiative, the *émigré* Poles threatened to launch a campaign which would have brought Washington and Moscow into opposition. It happened that Orlemanski's superiors were of Irish origin—which, obviously, did not predispose them to regard his journey with a favourable eye. In any case, the episcopal decision and the priest's submission cut short any attempts at propaganda, thus rendering a very opportune service to the Government, but postponing or compromising the perspective of a possible easing of the situation, if not of a *rapprochement* between Poland and the Soviets, and between the Soviets and the Vatican.

In Latin America the headquarters of the permanent Slav Committee were at Montevideo, where, in April, 1943, three hundred and ninety-four Slav delegates assembled at a Congress which established the Union of Slav Nationals (they were estimated at two millions), to organise the struggle against pro-Hitlerian activities.

* * *

This sketch of the recovery of the Slavs in the Old World and the New brings out two features: the gravitation of all the Slavonic nations round the Muscovite colossus, and the repugnance of a sector of Polish opinion to this method of regrouping.

As was to be anticipated, German propaganda affected to see in this the execution of a plan tending to 'Bolshevise' Europe, and even America. Germany again launched her old commonplaces about the inferiority of the Slavs. A Radio-Paris broadcast (February 21, 1943) assured listeners 'that about one-quarter of the American population is composed of Slavonic elements, of

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Turkish journalist) some people in Eastern Europe who would like to return to the old policy of oppression of the Slavonic peoples. . . . The new friendship among these peoples, related to each other and bound by century-old ties of a common culture, was being tempered in the crucible of the war of liberation. . . . Their *rapprochement* would displease none but those who dreamed of seeing them dominated once again'. 186* 829 204

* * *

The Orlemanski affair has shown us an attempt at Slav solidarity in the domain of religious tolerance. In the same order of things, but this time in connection with the Orthodox Slavs, we cannot omit to mention the deep impression produced by the restoration of juridical personality to the Russian Orthodox Church (September, 1943) and the elevation of the Metropolitan Serge to the office of Patriarch, abolished in 1721 by Peter the Great and which enjoyed a brief restoration in 1917. With its hundred and fifty million followers, the Orthodox community, placed at the cross-roads of the war, was undergoing one of the most tragic crises in its history. Its suffering was all the more serious, inasmuch as the Orthodox Churches are organised on national lines, in contrast to the hierarchical unity of Roman Catholicism. These churches are bound together by identical doctrine and canons. But, in the course of the centuries, they have progressively relaxed the bonds of dependence which used to attach them to the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Religious autonomy has advanced side by side with the emancipation of the nationalities. In restoring the rights of the Church, Stalin not only indicated his desire to reawaken the traditions of Russian national life, within the framework of a social renovation; he also tightened the historic bonds between his country and the Balkan nations of the Orthodox religion, thus reinforcing, by new spiritual affinities, sympathies founded on community of race, of oppression, and of destiny. 186* 659 796

Germany tried to foil this policy by summoning to Vienna, on November 5, under the presidency of the Metropolitan of Belgrade, the Orthodox prelates adhering to the Axis cause, and especially the Metropolitans of Berlin and of Paris, who declared the election of the new Patriarch to be null and void. This demonstration was of no effect; the vast majority of the Serbian, Rumanian, Greek and Bulgarian hierarchies either had nothing 648 793 795

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

to do with the protesting prelates,[11] or openly dissociated themselves from their attitude.

By way of retort, the first number of the *Moscow Patriarchy* published a message from the Council of Russian Bishops, assembled for the election, inviting Christians to pray for the victory of the Red Army and the fulfilment of the scriptural text invoked by Alexander Nevsky: 'He who strikes with the sword shall perish by the sword'. On September 8, this same Council had excommunicated 'as adversaries of the Cross of the Lord, all who have been guilty of treason to the common cause of the Church and gone over to Fascism'; the bishops and clergy guilty on this head were removed from their sacred office.

* * *

To conclude, the only obstacles to a general reconciliation of the Slavonic peoples came from the Poles. To summarise here the vicissitudes of Soviet-Polish relations since the pact of December, 1941, would mean not only relating the most stormy chapter in the Allies' war diplomacy, but also recalling the relations of the various groups among the Polish exiles, the antagonism between the London Committee and that of Lublin, the frontier problem, and also the perhaps more tragic problem of the political, religious, and social concepts on the basis of which the Polish State was to be re-born. Once again it was made very clear that Poland occupied a place apart on the map of the Slavonic world, and formed an obstacle to the realisation of full Slav solidarity.

Like the other Slavonic States, however, she had been caught up in the advance of the Russian armies sweeping across Eastern Europe—an onrush which settled the fate of the Slav nations, with or without their consent, as a consequence of their liberation. For three or four years Germany had been the second Slavonic power in the world. She had imposed on her Serbian, Croatian, Slovak, and Bulgarian satellites not only the horrors of the occupation, but also ideologies strongly opposed to their temperaments and their history; an impersonal and tyrannical idea of the State, a 'New Order' which was nothing but a hypocritical subjection, anti-Semitism which—with the exceptions of Poland and Imperial Russia—the Slavonic nations had always regarded with horror. When the collapse came, all these nations turned

[11] Among these, however, we must include the head of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Argentine.

[J. Poland - Analyst]

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

645 175 Communists, then rejoined the partisans in Bosnia and was elected President of the National Liberation Front.

687 175 The chief event of this period was the trial of General Draja Mihailovich, who had organised the earliest resistance to the invader, but was subsequently accused of collaboration with the Germans and the Italians. Arrested on the borders of Bosnia and Serbia, he was court-martialled on June 10, 1946, by the Military Tribunal of Belgrade, which condemned him to death on July 15. He was shot. Some American airmen had vainly asked to bear witness in his favour. The Belgrade Government had documents published establishing his 'treason'; they reveal undeniable complicity with the enemy in the lower ranks, and, especially, the implacable intention of eliminating the Communists from the Resistance; the role of Mihailovich himself is less clearly shown—which explains the emotion his condemnation aroused in England and in America.

[829] The *Daily Telegraph* thus expressed itself on this condemnation: 'The long perspective of history will enable the truth about the much-discussed figure of Mihailovich to be more clearly perceived. His contemporaries can do no more than think that caught up in the whirlwind of events beyond his control, he was a victim of Fate'.

In the same connection the British statesman, Noel Baker, declared that the decision to suspend aid to Mihailovich during the war had been taken as the result of numerous denunciations from various sources, alleging that he was no longer adequately contributing to the war effort. 'Subsequently', he said, 'it became evident that certain of his lieutenants were actively collaborating with the Germans'.

• 793 687 175 659 No less sensational was the trial of the Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Mgr. Aloysius Stepinac. This followed proceedings against numerous members of his clergy, notably that involving some Slovene priests, in December, 1945, at Ljubljana. The bishop of that town, Mgr. Rozman, a refugee in Italy, was condemned to eighteen years' imprisonment.

[208] The action against the Croatian priests accused of collaboration was prepared in January, 1946, by a violent press and radio campaign, denouncing the Archbishop's relations with the *Oustachi* of Pavelich, by whom he had been decorated (in

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

common with the Croatian Orthodox Metropolitan, Hermogene Maximov, and the German Lutheran bishop, Popov).

Arrested on September 18, 1946, Mgr. Stepinac was tried, on the 30th of the same month, not only on the charge of intelligence with the enemy, but also of having, after the liberation, worked with the opponents of the régime. These charges (as well as that of having forcibly converted Orthodox Christians to Catholicism) were upheld by the judges, who condemned the prelate (on October 11) to sixteen years' hard labour, to the loss of his civic rights for a period of five years, and to the confiscation of all his possessions. In vain had the defence recalled the fact that Mgr. Stepinac had protested against the racial laws and collective reprisals, and that the allied press had, while the war was actually in progress, rendered homage to his courageous stand.[3]

Pope Pius XII, in a public speech, protested against this verdict, denying the compulsory conversions—which, moreover, are contrary to canon law. And, although Tito had declared that the proceedings were by no means the prelude to a campaign against the Church in Czechoslovakia, Christian circles throughout the world protested against what they called a 'religious trial'. The 115 Catholic archbishops and bishops of the United States, assembled in Washington for their annual Assembly, described the verdict as 'an outrage on justice'. The Archbishop of Westminster declared that, during the war, 'in Croatia the only voice raised against Nazism and its works had been that of Archbishop Stepinac'.

The Vatican, in an unofficial note, recalled the Church's sanctions against members of the laity sitting in judgement on a bishop, or guilty of any act of violence upon his person; it nevertheless continued to maintain its Nuncio in Belgrade—Mgr. Patrick Hurley, a priest of American nationality, who had entered upon his office at the beginning of the year. In October, 1946, it appointed a co-adjutor to the Bishop of Maribor and another to the Bishop of Ljubljana. (In the absence of a

[3] A Catholic Agency announced, at the end of February 1947, that the President of the Croatian Government, Dr. Bakarich, was said to have invited the prelate to sign his appeal, giving him reason to hope that he might be liberated and, with American support, go abroad. Mgr. Stepinac refused, not wishing to leave either his people or his diocese.

6; Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

793 794 648 Concordat in Yugoslavia, the Vatican proceeds directly to the appointment of bishops, without previous agreement with the Government.)

648 175 [659] Relations between the Holy See and Belgrade again became strained when on January 31, 1947, Tito's Government handed to the Secretariat of State two notes, demanding the handing over of five Yugoslav 'war criminals', said to have taken refuge in the Vatican, and accusing the latter of having facilitated the escape to South America of other Yugoslav nationals, wanted by their country's police. The Pope denied these allegations, but added 'that he distinguished between those who were persecuted for political reasons, and criminals; to the former he gave every assistance in his power, without asking whence they came'.

Yugoslavia's external policy remained unshakeably based on Soviet support. 'The Slav peoples now look to Moscow as, after 1919, they looked to Paris; nothing is more natural', said a semi-official commentary on Tito's tour of Central Europe. Far from endeavouring to gain the confidence of the English and the Americans, whose co-operation a wise diplomacy would have sought, in order to bring their claims on Trieste to a successful conclusion, the Belgrade Government was continually in conflict with those powers.

Its relations with Washington were particularly chequered. On January 8, 1946, President Truman had declared: 'As regards Yugoslavia, recognition of the present Government is still subject to certain conditions'. (Moreover, he put Rumania and Bulgaria on the same footing.)

These 'conditions' were the assurance that the new Yugoslavia would recognise the existing treaties and agreements between the two countries (commercial exchanges, extraditions, naturalisations, etc.). Having obtained this assurance on April 18, he recognised Tito and appointed Mr. Richard Patterson ambassador in Belgrade. 'In granting diplomatic recognition', said the *Washington Post* next day, 'the United States are but looking unpleasant realities in the face'.

And when Sava Kosanovich, the representative of Yugoslavia, presented his credentials to President Truman, the latter said to him, with bantering courtesy: 'The United States are following, with interest and sympathy, the efforts of the Yugoslav people . . . to succeed, individually and in harmony with the United

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

797 648

at Kherson. And thither also at the same time arrived an Embassy from Pope John XV.[1]

797

Vladimir set to work with energy to make his people Christian. The idols of the great god Perun and others, erected in not too distant a past (for Vladimir before he embraced Christianity had toyed with the idea of revitalizing the pagan religion) were overthrown and churches built in their place. The more or less instructed people were baptized in droves in the Dnieper. Other influences were at work beside that of Byzantine Orthodoxy. The institution of tithes is found in the early Russian Church, and it would seem that that must have come from the West, and the same is true of the veneration of certain distinctively Latin saints.

Even before the time of Vladimir, books and perhaps missionaries also had arrived from Bulgaria. The work which the disciples of the Apostles of the Slavs had carried on in that country spread into Russia, with the result that the Russian Church had a Slavonic liturgy from the beginning. After Vladimir's death there was a continued period of quarrelling among his sons, in the course of which the celebrated Boris and Gleb, unresisting, met their deaths. But one of the sons, Yaroslav, finally succeeded in establishing his position and reigning for thirty-five years. He it was who finally settled the dependence of the Russian Church upon the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

[793]

In 1037 Alexis the Studite consecrated Theopemptos as Metropolitan of Kiev and thereafter, with two notable exceptions, the Russian Metropolitans were Greeks appointed from Constantinople until the fall of that city. Yaroslav was a great lawgiver and he raised Kiev to a status in which he treated with European nations on equal terms and married his daughters into royal houses of the West. He built the superb cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev and in his time the Petchersky Monastery was founded there. He died in 1054, the year in which the schism between Rome and Constantinople was finally consummated.

[1] On the puzzling question of the contact between the West and the Russian Church of this early period, see Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*. London, 1949, p. 173 ff. and 255 f.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

viction that the world was to be subdued to Islam. If the people they conquered were simple pagans they were offered the crisp alternative of accepting either Islam or death. But the Jews and the Christians were different. They were recognized as being, like the Mohammedans themselves, People of the Book. Each had a scripture, a written record of revelation. Their faith was regarded by the Turks as true but incomplete, since Mahomet had superseded both Moses and Christ.

The Orthodox were, therefore, permitted to survive and to practise their religion, but under severe restrictions. They had to pay tribute, to wear a distinctive dress and to conform to other irritating and humiliating regulations. In practising their religion they had to refrain from letting any outward sign of it be seen or heard; there were to be no crosses, for instance, on their churches, and no bells were to be rung. All this was the letter of the Law, nor was there any guarantee that it would be adhered to by the victorious Turkish governors; indeed, it was often violated by a harsh sultan or a blood-thirsty local administrator. There was much suffering and many instances of martyrdom. Doubtless there were many cases of apostasy also.[1] Social pressure was a more effective agent in winning converts to Islam than deliberate oppression and direct official action.[2] Its results are to be seen in the atrophy of the Christian Church in North Africa, and in the considerable number of adherents which Islam gained at the expense of Christianity in the Balkans.

But it is the glory of the Orthodox people as a whole that under centuries of Turkish oppression and misrule, with every inducement to abandon their religion, they remained faithful to it in spite of all.

For purposes of administration under the Turks the Orthodox Church became the *Rum Millet*—the Roman nation, with the Ecumenical Patriarch as its recognized head and representative. That is to say the Patriarch of Constantinople

[1] See Latourette: *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. III, p. 71 and f. London, 1945.

[2] It has been discovered in modern Russia that religion is like a nail, the harder you hit it, the deeper it goes in, and that the subtler policy of leaving social pressure to do its work is the wisest course for those who hope to see the disappearance of religion.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

793 659

was given civil jurisdiction over all the Orthodox within the Turkish Empire; he was responsible for their behaviour, they could approach the Government only through him. Thus, to his former claim to ecclesiastical precedence over the other Eastern Patriarchs, was now added a delegated civil jurisdiction as well.

The result was a signal example of the corrupting influence of power. The temptation to use secular authority as a means to ecclesiastical aggrandizement was strong, and it is one of the ironies of history that the Turkish régime led to the steady expansion of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. It reached its climax in the eighteenth century when the Churches of Rumania, Bulgaria and Serbia were brought under its sway and the Patriarchate extended right across Asia Minor. But the price paid was seen in the Patriarch's relation with his Turkish masters.

He was obliged to receive his "berat" from an infidel source, that is the confirmation of both his spiritual and secular authority. He was removed, and sometimes more than once reinstated, at the Sultan's will, and this combination of humiliating loss of prestige with the prize of rich emoluments led to a long and depressing story of simony and intrigue. There have been notable exceptions and some Patriarchs have suffered deprivation and even death for their principles. But over long periods of time the acquisition and tenure of the Patriarchate was a matter of intrigue and money, and the precarious nature of the dignity is reflected in the fact that "out of 159 Patriarchs who have held office between the fifteenth and twentieth centuries, the Turks have, on 105 occasions, driven Patriarchs from their throne; there have been 27 abdications, often involuntary; 6 Patriarchs have suffered violent deaths by hanging, poisoning or drowning; and only 21 have died natural deaths while in office."[1] During the seventy-five years from 1625 to 1700, there were 50 Patriarchs—an average of eighteen months each.[2]

793

Nor was the evil limited to the Patriarchate itself. The party which had bought the office for their nominee recovered

[1] Kidd: *The Churches of Eastern Christendom* (1927), p. 304.
[2] Fortescue: *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (1907), p. 242.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

their expenses, through him, from the Greek bishops whom he appointed to the sees within his vast jurisdiction. They in their turn passed on the burden to their parochial clergy, who finally reimbursed themselves from their parishioners in the Balkans and Asia Minor. 793

It must be remembered that the level of education and culture really was higher among the Greek clergy of the Phanar[1] than among the Bulgars, Serbs and Rumanians, and to that extent there was good reason for appointing Greek bishops in those "daughter" Churches. But it is not surprising that the system, especially in its fiscal aspect, gave rise to much resentment, and that when in the nineteenth century the Balkan peoples began to recover their political independence from the Turks, they were equally eager to escape from their ecclesiastical dependence upon Constantinople. This movement met with its first success in 1833 when the Church of the Kingdom of Greece declared its independence, though it had to wait seventeen years for its recognition by Constantinople. The Serbian Church followed suit in 1879 and the Rumanian in 1885. These independent Churches were established not without struggle and a good deal of friction, but at least they have remained in full communion with Constantinople. In the case of Bulgaria, however, it led to schism. The Bulgars claimed more than ecclesiastical independence within a defined locality, i.e., the Kingdom of Bulgaria; they insisted that the head of the Bulgarian Church must have jurisdiction over all Bulgars wherever they may live. This the Phanar would not agree to, and branded it as the heresy of "Phyletism".[2] In 1872 the Ecumenical Patriarch, with the concurrence of the other Patriarchs, except Cyril of Jerusalem, excommunicated the Bulgars, and the Schism remained till 1945. 793 795

Nothing perhaps more clearly illustrates the isolation into which the East was driven by the Schism of 1054 and the Turkish conquest than the fact that it had no part in the making or opposing of the Reformation, that great cataclysm which shook and split, and yet revivified, the Western Church in the

[1] The seat of the Patriarchate in Constantinople from 1586 onwards.
[2] Exaggerated emphasis upon the spirit of nationality in the ecclesiastical sphere.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

795
•793

sixteenth century. That is not to say that the Reformation had no effect at all upon the East. Its repercussions were felt there in the following century, and about this something must now be said. It is connected with the person of Cyril Lucar, a remarkable and tragic figure, whose personality and writings dominated Orthodoxy in the seventeenth century. He was born in Crete, which was then still under Venetian rule, in 1572. It was to Venice, and also Padua, that he went as a student, after which he settled in Alexandria, where he was ordained, became an Archimandrite and took his place in the immediate entourage of the Patriarch. In due course the latter sent him on a mission to Poland, the purpose of which seems to have been to try to persuade the Protestants in that country to become Orthodox. It was a fateful journey for Lucar, for while there he became attracted to Lutheran and Calvinist doctrines and followed the trail of them to Wittenberg and Geneva.

On his return he succeeded his late patron who died in 1603, and became Patriarch of Alexandria. Seventeen years later he was made Patriarch of Constantinople and continued so intermittently till his death in 1638. His tenure of that high office is a conspicuous example of the insecurity that attached to it under the Turkish régime, for he was six times deposed and as often reinstated during those years. Both at Alexandria and at Constantinople Lucar made vigorous and persistent efforts to popularize the ideas which had aroused his enthusiasm in the West, and to establish a reforming movement within the Orthodox Church on the same lines as had been adopted by the Western Reformers. With the co-operation of the Chaplain to the Dutch Embassy at Constantinople he started a Protestant school in that city, and put out a Greek version of the Bible which he had printed at Geneva and which bore evident doctrinal marks of its place of origin. He conceived and carried out a plan for sending promising theological students to study in Switzerland, Holland and England, the best known of them being Metrophanes Kritopoulos (himself later Patriarch of Alexandria) who was sent to Balliol College, Oxford. Lucar's relations with this country are of great interest. He corresponded with Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury; and the

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

fifth century manuscript of the Bible, known as Codex Alexandrinus which is one of the most precious treasures of the British Museum, was presented by Lucar to Charles I from the Library of Alexandria.

This strange figure of a Protestant Patriarch encountered violent opposition. Not only had he to face the solid uncompromising body of traditional Orthodoxy, he was met also by the bitter hostility of the Jesuits and of a Latinizing party within his own Church which had been formed by the proselytizing efforts of Roman Catholic missions. These were very active at the time, and enjoyed the support of France and Venice.

In 1629, Lucar published his celebrated *Confession*, a document which contained much Calvinist doctrine and inaugurated a controversy which was not settled until the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. Lucar himself was strangled by order of the Sultan on a trumped-up charge which his enemies brought against him. Just how far Cyril Lucar himself was a "heretic" has been disputed. It has been maintained that he did not hold the doctrines attributed to him, and the assertion of the Synod of Jerusalem that he did not write the *Confession* has been repeated by modern writers.[1] A synod held at Constantinople the year after his death condemned both Lucar and the *Confession*; the following Synods of Jassy and Jerusalem the *Confession* only. What is certain is that the Orthodox Church rose in a body to repudiate Lutheran, Calvinist or any other sort of "Protestant innovations"—whether Lucar held them or not.

The Synod of Jerusalem (sometimes called the Synod of Bethlehem, because it was convoked from that place) is of very great importance. It was convened with the express purpose of condemning the *Confession* attributed to Lucar but in doing so it promulgated a positive affirmation of the faith of the Orthodox Church.[2] Its acts include a Confession of Faith which "is a closely knit, carefully worked out summary of theological doctrine, in its phraseology very strongly

[1] E.g., Mesolora, and others. See Gavin: *Greek Orthodox Thought*, footnote on pp. 214 ff.

[2] The Acts of the Synod of Justin, and Cyril's *Confession* may be found in English in J. N. W. B. Robertson: *The Synod of Jerusalem*, 1899.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E11

785 between the octave of Whit Sunday and June 29, the festival of St. Peter and Paul.

796 Even outside these periods there are many days upon which the Orthodox faithful are expected to use only abstinence food, including, with a few exceptions, all Wednesdays and Fridays.

795 Furthermore, fasting itself is a much more rigorous affair among the Orthodox than it is in the West. It involves abstinence from any food of animal origin including fish, milk, eggs and butter. Indeed, the strict observer is left with little but bread, fruit and vegetables.

The extent to which this formidable programme is actually carried out is difficult to estimate. Doubtless like other observances of religion it has less hold upon people than it had, and town dwellers sit more lightly to it than the peasantry. Nevertheless, the Orthodox probably fulfil their obligation in this respect to an extent which would surprise the easy-going Westerner. Many of the devout are strict about it, and those who practise their religion at all will observe at least the first and last few days of the prescribed periods of fasting.

To the Orthodox, religion is very much concerned with this world as well as with the next, and fasting is of importance not only as a discipline of the human will. It expresses also the impact of the spiritual upon the material, the control of the world which is seen, by the power of the unseen world. It plays its part in causing the material to serve spiritual ends, and thus the human will shares in the process of rescuing and restoring the fallen world of Nature.

●793 The clergy are a visible link between the two worlds. The parish priest with his flowing cassock and unshorn hair stands apart. He is and is seen to be distinct from other men. He is a reminder of the unseen spiritual world in which both he and his flock are living even while they live in the day-to-day world of material things, and his ministrations apply the power of the spirit to daily life.

Yet if he stands apart, he does not stand aloof. The parochial clergy throughout the Orthodox East are required to be married men. But they must marry before they are ordained. Once they are ordained marriage is forbidden them.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Very frequently they marry the daughters of other priests, and thus clerical families tend to form a fairly well defined section of the community with its own traditions and general outlook. But in the country districts at any rate, and that is to say in the vast majority of cases, they live a life which is close to that of their parishioners. It is a simple life; they cultivate their own piece of land, and are not regarded as belonging to gentry. The question naturally arises, what happens if a parish priest is left a widower? Being a parish priest, he must have a wife, being ordained, he is precluded from marrying. In strict theory there is nothing for it but for him to give up his parish and retire into a monastery. But the theory is not unduly pressed, and he may even be allowed to have a female relation to look after his children. The bishops, on the other hand, are always chosen from among the monks, and they, of course, must remain unmarried. The married cleric can reach no higher dignity than that of Arch-priest. So that at the outset of his career the neophyte must make up his mind whether he will take a wife and settle down to parish work—or whether he will take the monastic vows and keep open the possibility of being made a bishop later on. Transition from one class to another is not common, but there are cases of widowed priests entering a monastery and subsequently being raised to episcopal rank.

The deacon is as familiar to the people as the priest, for the diaconate is not regarded in the East as a mere step towards the priesthood and expected to last only about a year. So far from being simply a sort of incomplete priest, the Greek or Russian deacon may remain in deacon's orders all his life, and he very frequently does. He has a well-defined status with its own specific function. The deacon has his own assigned part in the Liturgy, notably the chanting of the Litanies and the singing of the Gospel; one of his qualifications is the possession of a good voice. "Father Deacon" shares in the respect and affection which are commonly given to the parish priest. Should it unhappily be the case that the priest or deacon is not all that he ought to be and even notoriously otherwise, the people will not on that account stop going to Church. If you have a good priest, so much the better, thank God that it

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E1L

is as it should be. If you have a bad one, that is much to be deplored. But a priest of some sort you must have, for otherwise there are no worship and no sacraments, and these are just where, most conspicuously, the other world breaks through.

As the Church, with its succession of festivals and fasts keeps touch with the yearly cycle of Nature, so it shepherds the individual human life from the cradle to the grave. The rites that attend his birth and his death stress the link between the two worlds, and the fact that man lives in both at the same time. Even his baptism is not the first occasion on which a child of Orthodox parents will be brought into contact with the Church of which he is to become a member. On the day following the birth the priest comes to say prayers over the mother and child, and again a week later when the child is given his name. On the fortieth day from its birth the mother brings the child to Church, when prayers are said for the child, and if baptism has meanwhile been administered the priest carries the child through the church and (in the case of a male child) into the Sanctuary, reciting the *Nunc Dimittis*. But unless the child has been baptized at home, which is not infrequently the case, the latter ceremony will follow baptism. And the prayers of the eighth day are now combined with those of the first day. The rite of baptism is preceded by exorcism and a short catechism of renunciation of Satan and acceptance of Christ, which concludes with the recitation of the Nicene Creed.

The administration of the Sacrament itself begins with a Litany said by the deacon while the priest prays secretly for himself and for the one about to be baptized. This is followed by a long prayer said aloud, in the course of which the water is blessed in words which at times recall the phraseology of the Anglican rite; e.g.,

> "Grant that the person to be baptized therein may be thoroughly renewed, that he may put off the old man which is corrupt through deceitful lusts and put on the new man after the image of him that made him; that being planted in the likeness of his death by baptism, he may be partaker of his resurrection."

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E 16
Historical Bulgaria EE2
Historical Yugoslavia EF2

IV

SOURCES OF ANCIENT MAGIC AND MEDICINE

I

During the pagan and semi-pagan period the Slavs lived in small, independent tribes, later forming loose federations within territorial limits. For long the Greeks were unable to negotiate with them, because they did not agree among themselves and had no central authority. The organisation of a united state in Rascia coincided with the establishment of state Christianity, and the pagan empire of Bulgaria was comparatively short-lived.

The tribal religious cult was likely to have been an extension of a domestic cult, probably rarely accompanied by the specialised functions of an official priesthood. The domestic cult lasts to the present day. The head of the household officiates in ceremonial, and the assistance of an outsider is not essential. In ceremonial which involves the whole tribe or village, the heads of households—the tribal elders—are again responsible; but that they have not an entire monopoly of ritual is evident in ceremonies which are performed by a group without a specially chosen leader, particularly those which belong to the younger people, or ceremonies conducted by old women doctors, etc.[1]

[1] The rites of the peasants hint also at an independent development. It is not true only that the non-Christian element enjoyed a revival, tended to revert to type, after the fall of the mediaeval empire. A direction was taken at that time, perhaps, in which the popular religion continued a course of development and adaptation. The popular religion, or sometimes a popular aversion to religion as well as to social forms that flourished under a feudal church, must have sought new outlets much earlier. Local forms of peasant cults must be of comparatively recent growth, and contain more than the survivals of an ancient paganism. The *slava*, for instance, is a typical example of a domestic rite which does not require a special priesthood. It has become perhaps the central

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Historical Bulgaria EE2
Historical Yugoslavia EF2
Great Russians RF2
Slavic Peoples E 16

B Y SP 795 793 756 [887]

There is little trace of shamanism in the Balkans, and few instances of the combining of the functions of priest and doctor and magician except by accident. In peasant cults these offices are adopted to meet a special occasion, unless they are the speciality of a local wise woman. Women who have ceased to menstruate or widows may have to be chosen for certain rites, but this is only a temporary priesthood. The seeress mediates between ordinary people and spirits only when she is required to do so. Young men without physical defect only may be allowed to take part in certain ritual dances, etc. Almost each cult has its own 'priest'. The fulfilment of the village 'vows' and the sacrifice at the sacred village tree is performed by householders, and the high priest of the occasion is the host for that year. The mother of twins is, it is said, considered to be specially pure, and twins themselves have special occasional functions. I hazard that this arrangement is characteristic of peasant cults; and that the institution of a monopoly of priestcraft, whether on the part of the Christian church or by the priests of organised pagan cults, meant a profound social change, to uphold which popular custom had to be discredited.

B Y SP [845]

R SP 771 171

In Russia itself, so many parallels are found that a close

feature of the religious life of South Slav Orthodox communities and has died hard among the non-Orthodox. It represents an elaboration under peculiar circumstances of a strictly domestic cult with occasional ministrants, whose sporadic priestly duties are determined by their normal social function and status. A similar Lithuanian rite was also traditionally a strictly domestic affair. The *slava* embraces ideas and ceremonial found in the earliest accounts of Slav custom and which belonged to pre-Christian ideas, but other features, and the general form as we now know it, so closely resemble the celebration of the liturgy that the institution may well have arisen from an early practice of private celebrations, or imitations of the liturgy, perhaps at a time of a Christian minority, or further encouraged by the conditions of Turkish occupation. There is still a tendency to think that anything that is not traceable to the Churches' institutions is necessarily pre-Christian in origin. The cycle of Christmas rites also shows a mixture of sources and evidence of late formation, and considerable local variety when the cycle of the whole season, which may include rites transferred from other seasons, is considered. In any case, the past is not always 'fossilised'. While a

SP 795 174 771 793

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Great Russians RF2
Slavic Peoples E 16

connection with Asiatic shamanism was suggested many years ago. On the whole, the characteristics of magical practice are better mapped regionally than ethnologically; the Russian and West Slavs falling beside the Baltic and Finnish races of the north; while Balkan Slav folk-lore more closely resembles that of the neighbouring southern races.

In the process of time a religious sentiment has grown up about the ritual inherited from ancient semi-magical rites; and direct magic, conceived as such, figures principally as a part of a medical system, in which, however, empiricism now predominates, and magic is applied rationalistically. This division between applied magic and religion, between charm worker and the priest, seems to have existed since early times.

The pagan cult, as far as can be judged, recognised innumerable local and tribal gods, associated with the various activities of the people, such as war, agriculture, etc., or representing personifications; and an equally important cult of trees, stones and waters, in which, according to some, gods or spirits were supposed to reign. The Slavs of the East could not swear by trees, fountains or stones (but the priests gave accused persons the choice of trial by ploughshare, iron or

custom can in any sense be said to live, though it come out of the past it is also a part of actuality and a factor of present-day life and psychology. The popular religion is more sophisticated, and probably greatly more varied than any reconstruction of primitive cults that could be made. It depends on the vigour of the church organisation locally how far a distinction is made between standard Christian practice and the rest, and how far the non-Christian part of tradition is looked upon as not wholly in conformity with the nominal faith. Left to itself the folk-mind blends diverse elements into a single law. Certainly custom, particularly religious custom, is not in origin a direct response to the physical environment. Adjustment to the demands of a ruling class, for instance, is not expressed only on the economic plane. But there is a tendency to try to adapt institutions—even those forced upon a community—to material circumstances. Hence the permeation of all peasant cults by the dominant interest in provision for life and the staying of disaster. The Church would have had little chance of survival here had its rites not received an economic and apotropaeic interpretation, far removed from the spiritual benefits of its written doctrine.

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Great Russians RF2
Historical Bulgaria EE2
Historical Yugoslavia EF2
Slavic Peoples EV6

lot). The sacred oak tree is mentioned by several early chroniclers. Now while the cult of vegetation, water spirits, and to some lesser extent of stones, in the Balkans at any rate, retains most of its primal character and importance, so that the sacrificing to trees, or on trees, for instance, can be found almost exactly as described by Herbord among the West Slavs and by Ibn Rosteh in Russia, that of patron deities, of an ancient Slavonic pantheon, does not remain at all. Not a single name of a Slavonic god has been recorded here beyond doubt; not a single image recovered.

Taking all the evidence together, it is not impossible to conclude that the complex pantheism of the other Slavs which required an established priesthood, was not typical of the religion of the Southern Slavs; whereas in the north and west the priestly cult overshadowed older popular forms. Even there the cult of the sacred tree is spoken of as an ancient custom of the people, not one of the ministrations of the priests. The priests themselves delivered oracles as well as read omens; and besides carrying out performances within the shrine to which the populace was not admitted, or at which it assisted only as an audience, they took upon themselves to impersonate gods in order to mislead the ignorant. Literary sources in the Balkans have plentiful references to 'magicians', etc., but those to priests occur mainly in conventional accounts of paganism, except in the accounts of the Bulgars during the Asperuh period.

The two chief offices of priesthood were sacrifice and divining, which could, in the north, elevate the priest to the position of tribal leader. For the Balkans we are told that the reading of omens accompanied blood sacrifice.

The priests of the East and West Slavs were a caste apart, specially endowed and specially venerated. In the long list of terms connected with priestcraft and sorcery in early monuments, and in the vocabularies of modern languages, the titles of various kinds of priest and magician and

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E16
Historical Bulgaria EE 2

doctor indicate a difference of method and function rather than a distinct rank or profession. Long after the priest ceased to be recognised these different functions were regularly given their proper Slavonic names in the South Slav area also. In documents these are found mixed with names coined from Greek. In the *Syntagma*, for instance: '*O vlhvahъ, oučitelnyhъ, bajalničěhъ, ište že zvezdoslovcěhъ, obavničěhъ, nъ oubo i čarodejehъ, otrovnicehъ, i navezatelhъ.*' In another South Slav monument, the *Ivaničev Zbornik* (cf. *Starine*, XXIII, 56): '*ki věruje vešte nego ima vervati tako, kako su vražiteli i vražitelьnice i bahornice....*' In the Code of Dušan: '*volhъ, resnikъ, madjinikъ, otrovnikъ.*' Further we have: '*magьinik, glědačь, kobnikъ, vračь, bajalnikъ, obavьnikъ, oblakogonci, sanovnici.*' A gloss in the *Ilovačka Kormčaja* reads: '*...i o vlьsvěhъ i o obavnicehъ i o zvezdocьtьcihъ i provědьcihъ i o čarodějenihъ i o otrovleniihъ i o naouzehъ rekše ouzlehъ*' (cf. *Starine*, VI, p. 81). In a seventeenth-century manuscript: '*radi magesnicy i samovili i basnarki i zalaganie i brodnicy i baenie... samovili, basnarky, brodnicy, baene... i koito nositъ bourǫn na sebi*' (cf. Kačanovski, *Pamjatniki*, 32, etc.).

Magic was probably not simply a vocation but a gift, as it is reckoned to be to-day. Among the Old Bulgars, for instance, the second son of the emperor Simeon was given to magic and could turn himself into any kind of wild beast.[1]

Procopius refers to divining carried out by the priests at a blood sacrifice. Helmoldus relates that the people depended upon such prophecies in every emergency. On festivals they gathered to hear oracles, and to sacrifice. 'After the sacrifice the libation blood was poured over the priests that their oracles might be more propitious....For it is the opinion of many that the demon is freed the easier by means of blood.' Ditmar gives an account of divination by blood and ashes, and so on, and if historical evidence were lacking for the practices of the South Slavs, the blood sacrifice among

[1] Luitprandus Episc. Cremonensis, *Opera*, III, 29.